UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/659,111	09/09/2003	Fernando Incertis Carro	FR920020069US1	4337

			EXAMINER
26502	7590	12/14/2006	BESROUR, SAOUSSEN

IBM CORPORATION
IPLAW IQ0A/40-3
1701 NORTH STREET
ENDICOTT, NY 13760

ART UNIT.	PAPER NUMBER
2131	

DATE MAILED: 12/14/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/659,111	CARRO, FERNANDO INCERTIS
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Saoussen Besrour	2131	

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>9/9/2003</u>.

2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b) ☒ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) <u>1-13</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) <u>1-13</u> is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on <u>09 September 2003</u> is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a) ☒ All   b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:

      1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This action is in response to the communication filed 9/9/2003.

2.   Claims 1-13 were received for consideration.

3.   No preliminary amendments for the claims were filed. Currently claims 1-

13 are under consideration.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

2.   **Claim 1** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is

directed to non-statutory subject matter, as they do not fall under any of the statutory

classes of inventions. The language in the claims raise an issue because the claims

are directed merely to an abstract idea that is not tied to an article of manufacture which

would result in a practical application producing a concrete, useful, and tangible result to

form the basis of statutory subject matter under 35 U.S.C. 101.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3.   **Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12 and 13** rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e)

as being anticipated by Logue et al. (US 2002/0174341).

As per **claim 1**, Logue et al. discloses: A computer file containing digital data

wherein authentication information is encoded in the filename of said computer file at a

predetermined position or using delimiters (0061).

As per **claim 2**, Logue et al. discloses: computing a digital signature of the

computer file using a private key of a sender (0060); and, encoding said computed

digital signature in a filename of said computer file at a predetermined position or using

delimiters (0061).

As per **claim 8**, Logue et al. discloses: computing a digital signature of the

computer file using a private key of a sender (0060); and, encoding said computed

digital signature in a filename of said computer file at a predetermined position or using

delimiters (0061).

As per **claim 9**, Logue et al. discloses: computing a digital signature of the

computer file using a private key of a sender (0060); and, encoding said computed

digital signature in a filename of said computer file at a predetermined position or using

delimiters (0061).

As per **claim 10**, Logue et al. discloses: extracting said authentication

information from the filename of the computer file at a predetermined position or using

delimiters (0062); recovering an encoded hash value of the computer file by using a

public key of a sender of the computer file and the extracted authentication information

(0062); computing a hash value of said computer file using a hash function used by the

sender to generate the encoded authentication information (0062); comparing the

encoded and the computed hash values (0062); and, if the encoded and the computed

hash values are identical, processing the computer file, else, if the encoded and the

computed hash values are different, rejecting the computer file (0023, 0062, limited to

client identified by signature).

As per **claim 12**, Logue et al. discloses: extracting said authentication

information from the filename of the computer file at a predetermined position or using

delimiters (0062); recovering an encoded hash value of the computer file by using a

public key of a sender of the computer file and the extracted authentication information

(0062); computing a hash value of said computer file using a hash function used by the

sender to generate the encoded authentication information (0062); comparing the

encoded and the computed hash values (0062); and, if the encoded and the computed

hash values are identical, processing the computer file, else, if the encoded and the

computed hash values are different, rejecting the computer file (0023, 0062, limited to

client identified by signature).

As per **claim 13**, Logue et al. discloses: extracting said authentication

information from the filename of the computer file at a predetermined position or using

delimiters (0062); recovering an encoded hash value of the computer file by using a

public key of a sender of the computer file and the extracted authentication information

(0062); computing a hash value of said computer file using a hash function used by the

sender to generate the encoded authentication information (0062); comparing the

encoded and the computed hash values (0062); and, if the encoded and the computed

hash values are identical, processing the computer file, else, if the encoded and the

computed hash values are different, rejecting the computer file (0023, 0062, limited to

client identified by signature).

As per **claim 4**, rejected as applied to claim 2. Furthermore, Logue et al.

discloses: the step of computing a digital signature is based on a symmetric or public-

key algorithm (0057, 0060).

As per **claim 5**, rejected as applied to claim 2. Furthermore, Logue et al.

discloses: computing a hash value of said computer file; and computing a digital

signature of the computed hash value using the private key of the sender (0061).

As per **claim 6**, rejected as applied to claim 5. Furthermore, Logue et al.

discloses: computing a hash value uses a Secure Hash Algorithm or a Message-Digest-

5 algorithm (0061).

As per **claim 7 and 11**, rejected as applied to claim 2 and 10. Furthermore,

Logue et al. discloses: the step of applying said method to files attached or linked to the

computer file (0052).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4.   **Claim 3** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Logue et al. (US 2002/0174341) in view of Atkinson et al. (US 6,367,012).

As per **claim 3**, rejected as applied to claim 2. Logue et al. discloses: computing a digital signature of the computer file using a private key of a sender; and, encoding said computed digital signature in a filename of said computer file at a predetermined position or using delimiters. Logue et al. does not explicitly teach adding said computed digital signature in the filename just before the file extension, said computed digital signature having a fixed size. However, Atkinson et al. discloses: adding said computed digital signature in the filename just before the file extension, said computed digital signature having a fixed size (Column 6, Lines 50-Column 7, Lines 8). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in eth art at the time the invention was made to use the teachings of Atkinson et al. in conjunction with the teachings of Logue et al. as stated by Logue et al. in 0061, where it states the signature may be inserted anywhere in the URL.

Conclusion

5.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Saoussen Besrour whose telephone number is 571-272-6547. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30am to 5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Ayaz Sheikh can be reached on 571-272-3795. The fax phone number for

the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

SB
December 11, 2006

AYAZ SHEIKH
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100